



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/673,777 | 09/29/2003 | Volkert A. Zeijlemaker | P-10499.00 | 2479 |
| 27581 | 7590 | 06/28/2007 | | |
| MEDTRONIC, INC. 710 MEDTRONIC PARKWAY NE MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55432-9924 | | | EXAMINER RAMIREZ, JOHN FERNANDO | |
| | | | ART UNIT 3737 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | MAIL DATE 06/28/2007 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/673,777

Applicant(s)

ZEIJLEMAKER ET AL.

Examiner

John F. Ramirez

Art Unit

3737

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 14-20 and 22-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-11, 14-20, and 22-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/16/07 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The phrase "prescribed timed conditions" is considered to be new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1, 4-6, 8-10, 14-16, 22, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foster et al. (US 6,925,328) in view of Paul et al. (5,697,958). Foster et al. discloses a magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) device comprising: a magnet to generate a magnetic field (col. 1, lines 24-41); an electromagnetic radiation source to apply MRI electromagnetic radiation bursts (col. 1, lines 24-41) to the patient; an imaging unit to generate images of patient following application of radiation bursts (col. 8, lines 37-55); a receiver to receive information from an implantable medical device (IMD) (abstract); and a control unit to coordinate application of the electromagnetic radiation bursts based on the information (see Figure 5), the information defines a timing of stimulation pulses applied to a patient with the IMD, in which the received information defines a timing of the stimulation applied to the patient by the IMD (col. 7, lines 5- 67). Foster et al. does not explicitly teach an implantable medical device (IMD) having a telemetry unit that communicates timing information as to operational conditions of the IMD. In the same field of endeavor, Paul et al. discloses an implantable medical device with a telemetry antenna that receives information from a microprocessor and a timing circuitry to provide timing signals necessary to the operation of the device and transmit such information over outside the patient

concerning the operational conditions of the device (see abstract, figs. 1 and 2, col. 5, lines 9-35). Based on the above observations, for a person of ordinary skill in the art, modifying the method disclosed by Foster et al., with the above discussed enhancements would have been considered obvious because such modifications would provide better noise identification for the proper response of an IMD to avoid malfunction.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 11-13, 17, 18, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foster et al., in view of Paul et al. (5,697,958) and in further view Greatbatch (US 2003/0109901).

Foster et al. teaches all the limitations of the claimed subject matter as applied in claim 1, except for mentioning specifically an MRI system and a pacemaker which collects information of a cardiac cycle, and the received information includes an indication of sensed conditions measured by the IMD, an indication of one or more stimulations applied by the IMD, and the MRI device applies the electromagnetic radiation bursts based on the information.

However, an MRI system and a pacemaker which collects information of a cardiac cycle, and the received information includes an indication of sensed conditions measured by the IMD, an indication of one or more stimulations applied by the IMD, and the MRI device applies the electromagnetic radiation bursts based on the information is considered conventional in the art by the teachings of Greatbatch (see Abstract and Figure 1).

Based on the above observations, for a person of ordinary skill in the art, modifying the method disclosed by Foster et al., with the above discussed enhancements would have been considered obvious because such modifications would have provided a stand-alone cardiac stimulating and monitoring system during MRI scanning without operational disruption and without physiological injury to the patient's heart.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John F. Ramirez whose telephone number is (571) 272-8685. The examiner can normally be reached on (Mon-Fri) 7:30 - 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian L. Casler can be reached on (571) 272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3737

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JFR


BRIAN L. CASLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700